

# A Path Order for Rewrite Systems that Compute Exponential Time Functions\*

Technical Report

Martin Avanzini

Institute of Computer Science  
University of Innsbruck, Austria  
martin.avanzini@uibk.ac.at

Naohi Eguchi

School of Information Science  
Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, Japan  
n-eguchi@jaist.ac.jp

Georg Moser

Institute of Computer Science  
University of Innsbruck, Austria  
georg.moser@uibk.ac.at

June 10, 2011

In this paper we present a new path order for rewrite systems, the *exponential path order*  $\text{EPO}^*$ . Suppose a term rewrite system  $\mathcal{R}$  is compatible with  $\text{EPO}^*$ , then the runtime complexity of  $\mathcal{R}$  is bounded from above by an exponential function. Further, the class of function computed by a rewrite system compatible with  $\text{EPO}^*$  equals the class of functions computable in exponential time on a Turing machine.

---

\*This research is supported by FWF (Austrian Science Fund) projects P20133-N15.

## Contents

|          |                                    |           |
|----------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Preliminaries</b>               | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Exponential Path Order EPO</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Exponential Path Order EPO*</b> | <b>9</b>  |
| 4.1      | Soundness . . . . .                | 11        |
| 4.2      | Completeness . . . . .             | 15        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Implementation</b>              | <b>17</b> |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Conclusion</b>                  | <b>19</b> |

# 1 Introduction

In this paper we are concerned with the complexity analysis of term rewrite systems (TRSs) and the ramifications of such an analysis in implicit computational complexity (ICC for short).

Term rewriting is a conceptually simple but powerful abstract model of computation that underlies much of declarative programming. In rewriting, proving termination is an important research field. Powerful methods have been introduced to establish termination of TRSs (see [5] for an overview). In order to assess the complexity of a (terminating) TRS it is natural to look at the maximal length of derivations. More precisely in [17] the *derivational complexity* of a TRS is studied, where the derivational complexity function relates the length of a longest derivation sequence to the size of the initial term. A more fine-grained approach is introduced in [12] (compare also [16]), where the derivational complexity function is refined so that in principle only argument normalised (aka basic) terms are considered. In the following we refer to the latter notion as the *runtime complexity* of a TRS.

In recent years the field of complexity analysis of rewrite systems matured and some advances towards an automated complexity analysis of TRSs evolved (see [19] for an overview). The current focus of modern complexity analysis of rewrite systems is on techniques that yield *polynomial* runtime complexity. In this paper we study a complementary view and introduce the path order  $\text{EPO}^*$ . The definition of  $\text{EPO}^*$  makes use of *tiering* [7] and is strongly influenced by a very recent term-rewriting characterisation of the class of functions computable in exponential time by Arai and the second author [1].

**Example 1.1.** Consider the following TRS  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{fib}}$  which is easily seen to represent the computation of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  Fibonacci number.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{fib}(x) \rightarrow \text{dfib}(x, 0) & \text{dfib}(0, y) \rightarrow \text{s}(y) \\ \text{dfib}(\text{s}(0), y) \rightarrow \text{s}(y) & \text{dfib}(\text{s}(\text{s}(x)), y) \rightarrow \text{dfib}(\text{s}(x), \text{dfib}(x, y)) \end{array}$$

Then all rules in the TRS  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{fib}}$  can be oriented with  $\text{EPO}^*$ , which allows us to (automatically) deduce that the runtime complexity of this system is exponential. Exploiting graph rewriting we show that any TRS compatible with  $\text{EPO}^*$  is computable in exponential time on a Turing machine. Conversely we show that any function  $f$  that can be computed in exponential time can be computed by a TRS  $\mathcal{R}(f)$  such that  $\mathcal{R}(f)$  is compatible with  $\text{EPO}^*$ . Hence we provide soundness and completeness for  $\text{EPO}^*$  with respect to the class of functions computable in exponential time.

*Related Work.* With respect to rewriting we mention [15], where it is shown that *matrix interpretations* yield exponential derivational complexity, hence at most exponential runtime complexity. Our work is also directly related to work in ICC (see [6] for an overview). Here we want to mention [9, 11] where alternative characterisations of the class of functions computable in exponential time are given. For less directly related work we cite [8], where a complete characterisation of (imperative) programs that admit linear and polynomial runtime complexity is established. As these characterisations are

decidable, we obtain a decision procedure for programs that admit a runtime complexity that is at least exponential.

The remaining of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we recall definitions. In Section 3 we introduce the intermediate order EPO. Our main result is presented in Section 4. In Section 5 we show how the ordering constraints imposed by EPO<sup>\*</sup> can be expressed in propositional logic. Using a state-of-the-art SAT-solvers, this gives us a machinery to automatically verify compatibility of TRSs with EPO<sup>\*</sup>. Finally, we conclude in Section 6.

## 2 Preliminaries

We briefly recall central definitions and introduce employed notions. We assume a basic understanding of complexity theory [18]. We write  $\mathbb{N}$  for the set of *natural numbers*. Let  $R \subseteq A \times A$  be a binary relation. We write  $a R b$  instead of  $(a, b) \in R$ . We denote by  $R^+$  the transitive and by  $R^*$  the transitive and reflexive closure of  $R$ . Further,  $R^n$  denotes the  $n$ -fold composition of  $R$ . The relation  $R$  is *well-founded* if there exists no infinite sequence  $a_1 R a_2 R \dots$ , the relation  $R$  is *finitely branching* if  $\{b \mid a R b\}$  is finite for all  $a \in A$ . A *preorder* is a reflexive and transitive binary relation. If  $\succsim$  is a preorder, we write  $\approx := \succsim \cap \preceq$  and  $\succ := \succsim \setminus \approx$  do denote the *equivalence* and *strict part* of  $\succsim$  respectively.

We follow the notions of *term rewriting* from [5]. Let  $\mathcal{V}$  denote a countably infinite set of variables and  $\mathcal{F}$  a signature, i.e, a set of function symbols with associated arities. With  $\text{ar}(f) \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote the *arity* of  $f$ . The set of terms over  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ . We denote by  $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}, \dots$  sequences of terms, and for a set of terms  $T$  we write  $\mathbf{t} \subseteq T$  to indicate that for each  $t_i$  appearing in  $\mathbf{t}$ ,  $t_i \in T$ . We suppose that the signature  $\mathcal{F}$  is partitioned into *defined symbols*  $\mathcal{D}$  and *constructors*  $\mathcal{C}$ . The set of *basic terms*  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  is defined as  $\mathcal{B} := \{f(t_1, \dots, t_n) \mid f \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } t_i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V}) \text{ for } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ .

We write  $\sqsubseteq$  and  $\supseteq$  to denote the *subterm* and respectively *superterm* relation, the strict part of  $\sqsubseteq$  (respectively  $\supseteq$ ) is denoted by  $\triangleleft$  (respectively  $\triangleright$ ). Let  $t$  be a term. We denote by  $|t|$  and  $\text{dp}(t)$  the *size* and *depth* of the term  $t$ . If  $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ , we denote by  $\text{rt}(t)$  the *root symbol*  $f$ . Let  $\square$  be a constant not appearing in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Elements from  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{\square\}, \mathcal{V})$  with exactly one occurrence of  $\square$  are called *contexts* and denoted by  $C$ ,  $C[t]$  denotes the term obtained by replacing  $\square$  in  $C$  by  $t$ . A *substitution* is a mapping  $\sigma : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ , extended to terms in the obvious way. We write  $t\sigma$  instead of  $\sigma(t)$ . A *quasi-precedence* (or simply *precedence*) is a preorder  $\succsim = \succ \uplus \approx$  on the signature  $\mathcal{F}$  so that the strict part  $\succ$  is well-founded.

A *term rewrite system* (TRS for short) is a set of rewrite rules  $l \rightarrow r$  such that  $l \notin \mathcal{V}$  and all variables in  $r$  occur in  $l$ . We always use  $\mathcal{R}$  to denote a TRS. If not mentioned otherwise,  $\mathcal{R}$  is *finite*. We denote by  $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$  the *rewrite relation* as induced by  $\mathcal{R}$ , i.e.,  $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t$  if  $s = C[l\sigma]$  and  $t = C[r\sigma]$  for some rule  $l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}$ . With  $\dot{\rightarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$  we denote the *innermost rewrite relation*, that is, the restriction of  $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$  where additionally all proper subterms of  $l\sigma$  are normal forms. Here a term  $t$  is in *normal form* if there exists no  $u$  such that  $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ . The set of all *normal forms* of  $\mathcal{R}$  is denoted by  $\text{NF}(\mathcal{R})$ . We write

$t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^! u$  (respectively  $t \dot{\rightarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^! u$ ) if  $t \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$  (respectively  $t \dot{\rightarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ ) and  $u \in \text{NF}(\mathcal{R})$ . A rewrite step is a *root step* if  $C = \square$  in the definition of  $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ . The TRS  $\mathcal{R}$  is a *constructor* TRS if left-hand sides are basic terms,  $\mathcal{R}$  is *completely defined* if each defined symbol is completely defined. Here a symbol is completely defined if it does not occurring in any normal form. The TRS  $\mathcal{R}$  is called *terminating* if  $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$  is well-founded,  $\mathcal{R}$  is *confluent* if for all terms  $s, t_1, t_2$  with  $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t_1$  and  $s \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* t_2$ , there exists  $u$  such that  $t_1 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$  and  $t_2 \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^* u$ .

Let  $\rightarrow$  be a finitely branching, well-founded binary relation on terms. The *derivation height* of a term  $t$  with respect to  $\rightarrow$  is given by  $\text{dh}(t, \rightarrow) := \max\{n \mid \exists u. t \rightarrow^n u\}$ . The (innermost) *runtime complexity* of the TRS  $\mathcal{R}$  is defined as

$$\text{rc}_{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}(n) := \max\{\text{dh}(t, \rightarrow) \mid t \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } |t| \leq n\},$$

where  $\rightarrow$  denotes  $\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$  or  $\dot{\rightarrow}_{\mathcal{R}}$  respectively.

Let  $M$  be a *Turing machine* (TM for short) [18] with alphabet  $\Sigma$ , and let  $w \in \Sigma^*$ . We say that  $M$  computes  $v \in \Sigma^*$  on input  $w$ , if  $M$  accepts  $w$ , i.e.,  $M$  halts in an accepting state, and  $v$  is written on a dedicated output tape. We say that  $M$  computes a binary relation  $R \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^*$  if for all  $w, v \in \Sigma^*$  with  $w R v$ ,  $M$  computes  $v$  on input  $w$ . Note that if  $M$  is deterministic then  $R$  induces a partial function  $f_R : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ , we also say that  $M$  computes the function  $f_R$ .

Let  $S : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  denote a bounding function. We say that  $M$  runs in time  $S(n)$  if for all but finitely many inputs  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , no computation is longer than  $S(|w|)$ . Here  $|w|$  refers to the length of the input  $w$ . We denote by  $\text{FTIME}(S(n))$  the class of functions computable by some TM  $M$  in time  $S(n)$ . Then  $\text{FP} := \text{FTIME}(\mathcal{O}(n^k))$  where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  is the class of *polynomial-time computable functions*. Of particular interest for this paper is the class of *exponential-time computable functions*  $\text{FEXP} := \text{FTIME}(2^{\mathcal{O}(n^k)})$  where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

### 3 Exponential Path Order EPO

In this section, we introduce an intermediate order EPO, extending the definitions and results originally presented in [14]. The path order EPO is defined over *sequences* of terms from  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ . To denote sequences, we use an auxiliary function symbol `list`. The function symbol `list` is variadic, i.e., the arity of `list` is finite, but arbitrary. We write  $[t_1 \ \dots \ t_n]$  instead of `list`( $t_1, \dots, t_n$ ). For sequences  $[s_1 \ \dots \ s_n]$  and  $[t_1 \ \dots \ t_m]$ , we write  $[s_1 \ \dots \ s_n] \frown [t_1 \ \dots \ t_m]$  to denote the concatenation  $[s_1 \ \dots \ s_n \ t_1 \ \dots \ t_m]$ . We write  $\mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  for the set of finite sequences of terms from  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ , i.e.  $\mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}) := \{[s_1 \ \dots \ s_n] \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } s_1, \dots, s_n \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})\}$ . Each term  $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  is identified with the single list  $[t] = \text{list}(t) \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ . This identification allows us to ensure  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ . We use  $a, b, c, \dots$  to denote elements of  $\mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ , possibly extending them by subscripts.

Let  $\succsim$  to denote a (quasi-)precedence on the signature  $\mathcal{F}$ . We lift the equivalence  $\approx \subseteq \succsim$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  to terms in the obvious way:  $s \approx t$  iff (i)  $s = t$ , or (ii)  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ ,  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ ,  $f \approx g$  and  $s_i \approx t_i$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Further, we write  $\triangleright_{\approx}$  for the *superterm relation modulo term equivalence*  $\approx$ , defined by  $f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \triangleright_{\approx} t$  if  $s_i \triangleright_{\approx} t$

for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Here  $\triangleright/\approx := \triangleright/\approx \cup \approx$ . The precedence  $\succ$  induces a *rank*  $\text{rk}(f) \in \mathbb{N}$  on  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  as follows:  $\text{rk}(f) = \max\{1 + \text{rk}(g) \mid g \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } f \succ g\}$ , where we suppose  $\max \emptyset = 0$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $a, b \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ , and let  $k \geq 1$ . Below we assume  $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ . We define  $a >_{\text{epo}}^k b$  with respect to the precedence  $\succ$  if either

- 1)  $a = f(s_1, \dots, s_m)$  and  $s_i \geq_{\text{epo}}^k b$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , or
- 2)  $a = f(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ ,  $b = [t_1 \cdots t_n]$  with  $n = 0$  or  $2 \leq n \leq k$ ,  $f$  is a defined function symbol, and  $a >_{\text{epo}}^k t_j$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , or
- 3)  $a = f(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ ,  $b = g(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  with  $n \leq k$ ,  $f$  is a defined function symbol with  $f \succ g$ , and  $a$  is a strict superterm (modulo  $\approx$ ) of all  $t_j$  ( $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ), or
- 4)  $a = [s_1 \cdots s_m]$ ,  $b = b_1 \frown \cdots \frown b_m$ , and for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,
  - $s_1 \approx b_1, \dots, s_{j-1} \approx b_{j-1}$ ,
  - $s_j >_{\text{epo}}^k b_j$ , and
  - $s_{j+1} \geq_{\text{epo}}^k b_{j+1}, \dots, s_m \geq_{\text{epo}}^k b_m$ , or
- 5)  $a = f(s_1, \dots, s_m)$ ,  $b = g(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  with  $n \leq k$ ,  $f$  and  $g$  are defined function symbols with  $f \approx g$ , and for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, \min(m, n)\}$ ,
  - $s_1 \approx t_1, \dots, s_{j-1} \approx t_{j-1}$ ,
  - $s_j \triangleright/\approx t_j$ , and
  - $a \triangleright/\approx t_{j+1}, \dots, a \triangleright/\approx t_n$ .

Here we set  $\geq_{\text{epo}}^k := >_{\text{epo}}^k \cup \approx$ . Finally, we set  $>_{\text{epo}} := \bigcup_{k \geq 1} >_{\text{epo}}^k$  and  $\geq_{\text{epo}} := \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \geq_{\text{epo}}^k$ .

We note that, by Definition 3.1.2 with  $n = 0$ , we have  $f(s_1, \dots, s_m) >_{\text{epo}}^k []$  for all  $k \geq 1$  if  $f$  is a defined function symbol. It is not difficult to see that  $l \leq k$  implies  $>_{\text{epo}}^l \subseteq >_{\text{epo}}^k$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** Let  $a = a_1 \frown \cdots \frown a_m \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Suppose that  $a_j >_{\text{epo}}^k a'_j$ . Then  $a >_{\text{epo}}^k a_1 \frown \cdots \frown a_{j-1} \frown a'_j \frown a_{j+1} \cdots \frown a_m$ .

*Proof.* Put  $a' := a_1 \frown \cdots \frown a_{j-1} \frown a'_j \frown a_{j+1} \cdots \frown a_m$ . If  $a_j \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ , then  $a >_{\text{epo}}^k a'$  by Definition 3.1.4. Hence suppose that  $a_j \notin \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ . Then, there exist  $n \geq 2$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  such that  $a_j = [t_1 \cdots t_n]$ . Since we have  $a_j >_{\text{epo}}^k a'_j$ , according to Definition 3.1.4 there exist  $j_0 \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  such that  $a'_j = b_1 \frown \cdots \frown b_n$ ,  $t_{j_0} >_{\text{epo}}^k b_{j_0}$ , and  $t_i \geq_{\text{epo}}^k b_i$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Hence, again by Definition 3.1.4, we can conclude  $a >_{\text{epo}}^k a'$ .  $\square$

Following Arai and Moser [2] we define  $G_k$  that measures the  $>_{\text{epo}}^k$ -descending lengths:

**Definition 3.3.** We define  $G_k : \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  as

$$G_k(a) := \max\{G_k(b) + 1 \mid b \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}) \text{ and } a >_{\text{epo}}^k b\}.$$

**Lemma 3.4.** For all  $k \geq 1$  we have (i)  $\triangleright/\approx \subseteq >_{\text{epo}}^k$ , and (ii) if  $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  then  $G_k(t) = \text{dp}(t)$ , and (iii)  $G_k([t_1 \cdots t_m]) = \sum_{i=1}^m G_k(t_i)$ .

*Proof.* The Properties (i) and (ii) can be shown by straight forward inductive arguments. We prove (iii) for the non-trivial case  $m \geq 2$ . It is not difficult to check that  $G_k([t_1 \cdots t_m]) \geq \sum_{i=1}^m G_k(t_i)$ . We show that  $G_k([t_1 \cdots t_m]) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m G_k(t_i)$  by induction on  $G_k([t_1 \cdots t_m])$ .

Let  $a = [t_1 \cdots t_m]$ . Then, it suffices to show that, for any  $b \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ , if  $a >_{\text{epo}}^k b$ , then  $G_k(b) < \sum_{i=1}^m G_k(t_i)$ . Fix  $b \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  and suppose that  $a >_{\text{epo}}^k b$ . Then, by Definition 3.1.4, there exist some  $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $b = b_1 \cap \dots \cap b_m$ ,  $t_i \geq_{\text{epo}}^k b_i$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , and  $t_j >_{\text{epo}}^k b_j$ . By the definition of  $G_k$ , we have that  $G_k(t_i) \geq G_k(b_i)$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , and  $G_k(t_j) > G_k(b_j)$ . Thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^m G_k(b_i) < \sum_{i=1}^m G_k(t_i)$$

follows. Let  $b_i = [u_{i,1} \cdots u_{i,n_i}]$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Then, since  $G_k(b) < G_k(a)$ ,  $G_k(b) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} G_k(u_{i,j})$  holds by induction hypothesis. Recalling that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} G_k(u_{i,j}) \leq G_k(b_i)$  also holds we finally obtain that

$$G_k(b) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} G_k(u_{i,j}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m G_k(b_i) < \sum_{i=1}^m G_k(t_i).$$

□

**Theorem 3.5.** Suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  with arity  $n \leq k$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ . Let  $N := \max\{G_k(t_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} + 1$ . Then

$$G_k(f(t_1, \dots, t_n)) \leq (k+1)^{N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)}.$$

*Proof.* We prove the theorem by induction on  $N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)$ . Let  $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ . In the base case,  $f$  is minimal in the precedence  $\succ$  on the signature  $\mathcal{F}$  and the arguments of  $f$  are empty. Hence,  $G_k(t) = G_k(f) = 1 \leq (k+1)^{N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)}$ . For the induction case, it suffices to show that, for any  $b \in \mathcal{T}^*(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ , if  $t >_{\text{epo}}^k b$  then  $G_k(b) < (k+1)^{N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)}$ . The induction case splits into five cases according to the last rule which concludes  $t >_{\text{epo}}^k b$ . We consider the most interesting cases:

- 1) CASE  $t_i \geq_{\text{epo}}^k b$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ : In this case,

$$G_k(b) \leq G_k(t_i) < (k+1)^{N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)}.$$

- 2) CASE  $b = g(u_1, \dots, u_m)$  where  $m \leq k$ ,  $g$  is a defined symbol with  $f \succ g$  and for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $t$  is a strict superterm (modulo  $\approx$ ) of  $u_i$ : Let  $M := \max\{G_k(u_i) \mid$

$1 \leq i \leq m\} + 1$ . Then, we have  $M \leq N$  since  $t$  is a strict superterm (modulo  $\approx$ ) of every  $u_i$ . We claim

$$M^k \cdot \text{rk}(g) + \sum_{i=1}^m M^{k-i} G_k(u_i) < N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i) .$$

To see this, conceive left- and right-hand side as numbers represented in base  $M$  and respectively  $N$  of length  $k$  (observe  $G_k(u_i) < M$  and  $G_k(t_i) < N$ ). From  $\text{rk}(g) < \text{rk}(f)$  and  $M \leq N$  the above inequality is obvious. Hence, by induction hypothesis, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} G_k(b) &\leq (k+1)^{M^k \cdot \text{rk}(g) + \sum_{i=1}^m M^{k-i} G_k(u_i)} \\ &< (k+1)^{N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)} . \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

- 3) CASE  $b = g(u_1, \dots, u_m)$  where  $m \leq k$ ,  $g$  is a defined symbol with  $f \approx g$  and there exists  $j \in \{1, \dots, \min(n, m)\}$  such that  $t_i \approx u_i$  for all  $i < j$ ,  $t_j$  is a strict superterm (modulo  $\approx$ ) of  $u_j$ , and  $t$  is a strict superterm (modulo  $\approx$ ) for all  $i > j$ : Let  $M := \max\{G_k(u_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\} + 1$  and consider the following claim:

**Claim 3.6.**  $\sum_{i=1}^m M^{k-i} G_k(u_i) < \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)$ .

To prove this claim, observe that the assumptions give  $G_k(t_i) = G_k(u_i)$  for all  $i < j$ ,  $G_k(t_j) < G_k(u_j)$ , and  $G_k(t_i) < G_k(u_i)$  for all  $i > j$ : This implies that  $M \leq N$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m M^{k-i} G_k(u_i) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} N^{k-i} G_k(t_i) + N^{k-j} (G_k(t_j) - 1) + \sum_{i=j+1}^n N^{k-i} (N - 1) \\ &< \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i) . \end{aligned}$$

The claim together with induction hypothesis yields Equations (1) as above, concluding the case.

- 4) CASE  $b = [u_1 \cdots u_m]$  where  $m = 0$  or  $2 \leq m \leq k$  and  $t >_{\text{epo}}^k u_j$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ : First suppose  $m = 0$ , i.e.,  $b = []$ . Then  $G_k(b) = 0$  by Lemma 3.4 and the Theorem follows trivially. Hence suppose  $2 \leq m \leq k$ . From the former cases, it is not difficult to see that

$$G_k(u_i) \leq (k+1)^{(N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)) - 1} .$$

for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Therefore by Lemma 3.4, and employing  $m \leq k$ , we see

$$\begin{aligned} G_k(b) &= \sum_{i=1}^m G_k(u_i) \leq k \cdot (k+1)^{(N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)) - 1} \\ &< (k+1)^{N^k \cdot \text{rk}(f) + \sum_{i=1}^n N^{k-i} G_k(t_i)} . \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## 4 Exponential Path Order EPO<sup>\*</sup>

We now present the *exponential path order* (EPO<sup>\*</sup> for short), defined over terms  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$ . We call a precedence  $\succsim$  *admissible* if constructors are minimal, i.e., for all defined symbols  $f$  we have  $f \succ c$  for all constructors  $c$ . Throughout the following, we fix  $\succsim$  to denote an *admissible* quasi-precedence on  $\mathcal{F}$ . A *safe mapping* **safe** on  $\mathcal{F}$  is a function  $\text{safe} : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{N}}$  that associates with every  $n$ -ary function symbol  $f$  the set of *safe argument positions*  $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Argument positions included in  $\text{safe}(f)$  are called *safe*, those not included are called *normal* and collected in  $\text{nrm}(f)$ . For  $n$ -ary constructors  $c$  we require that all argument positions are safe, i.e.,  $\text{safe}(c) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . To simplify the presentation, we write  $f(t_{i_1}, \dots, t_{i_k}; t_{j_1}, \dots, t_{j_l})$  for the term  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  with  $\text{nrm}(f) = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  and  $\text{safe}(f) = \{j_1, \dots, j_l\}$ . We restrict term equivalence  $\approx$  in the definition of  $\approx^s$  below so that the separation of arguments through **safe** is taken into account: We define  $s \approx^s t$  if either (i)  $s = t$ , or (ii)  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_l; s_{l+1}, \dots, s_{l+m})$ ,  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_l; t_{l+1}, \dots, t_{l+m})$  where  $f \approx g$  and  $s_i \approx^s t_i$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . The definition of an instance  $>_{\text{epo}^*}$  of EPO<sup>\*</sup> is split into two definitions.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  such that  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_l; s_{l+1}, \dots, s_{l+m})$ . Then  $s \sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} t$  if  $s_i \sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} t$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Further, if  $f \in \mathcal{D}$ , then  $i \in \text{nrm}(f)$ . Here we set  $\sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} := \sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} \cup \approx^s$ .

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  such that  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_l; s_{l+1}, \dots, s_{l+m})$ . Then  $s >_{\text{epo}^*} t$  with respect to the admissible precedence  $\succsim$  and safe mapping **safe** if either

- 1)  $s_i \geq_{\text{epo}^*} t$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, l+m\}$ , or
- 2)  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_{k+n})$ ,  $f \succ g$  and
  - 1)  $s \sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} t_1, \dots, s \sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} t_k$ , and
  - 2)  $s >_{\text{epo}^*} t_{k+1}, \dots, s >_{\text{epo}^*} t_{k+n}$ , or
- 3)  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_{k+n})$ ,  $f \approx g$  and for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, \min(l, k)\}$ 
  - 1)  $s_1 \approx^s t_1, \dots, s_{i-1} \approx^s t_{i-1}$ ,  $s_i \sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} t_i$ ,  $s \sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} t_{i+1}, \dots, s \sqsubseteq_{\text{epo}^*} t_k$ , and
  - 2)  $s >_{\text{epo}^*} t_{k+1}, \dots, s >_{\text{epo}^*} t_{k+n}$ .

Here we set  $\geq_{\text{epo}^*} := >_{\text{epo}^*} \cup \approx^s$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** Suppose  $\mathcal{R}$  is a constructor TRS compatible with  $>_{\text{epo}^*}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq >_{\text{epo}^*}$ . Then the innermost runtime complexity  $\text{rc}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(n)$  is bounded by an exponential  $2^{O(n^k)}$  for some fixed  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We prove Theorem 4.3 in Section 4.1.

**Example 4.4.** [Example 1.1 continued]. Let **safe** be the safe mapping such that  $\text{safe}(\text{fib}) = \emptyset$  and  $\text{safe}(\text{dfib}) = \{2\}$ . Further, let  $\succsim$  be the admissible precedence with  $\text{fib} \succ \text{dfib} \succ s \approx 0$ . Then one verifies that  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{fib}} \subseteq >_{\text{epo}^*}$  for the induced order  $>_{\text{epo}^*}$ . By Theorem 4.3 we conclude that the innermost runtime complexity of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{fib}}$  is exponentially bounded.

Define the *derivational complexity* of a rewrite system  $\mathcal{R}$  as  $dc_{\mathcal{R}}(n) := \max\{\text{dh}(t, \rightarrow) \mid t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V}) \text{ and } |t| \leq n\}$ . The following example demonstrates that Theorem 4.3 *does neither* hold for full rewriting *nor* derivational complexity.

**Example 4.5.** Consider the TRS  $\mathcal{R}_d$  consisting of the rules

$$d(;x) \rightarrow c(;x,x) \quad f(0;y) \rightarrow y \quad f(s(;x);y) \rightarrow f(x;d(;f(x;y))) .$$

Then  $\mathcal{R}_d \subseteq >_{\text{epo}\star}$  for the precedence  $f \succ d \succ c$  and safe mapping as indicated in the definition of  $\mathcal{R}_d$ . Theorem 4.3 proves that the innermost runtime complexity of  $\mathcal{R}_d$  is exponentially bounded.

On the other hand, the runtime complexity of  $\mathcal{R}_d$  (with respect to full rewriting) grows strictly faster than any exponential: Consider for arbitrary  $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  the term  $f(s^n(0), t)$ . We verify, for  $n > 0$ ,  $\text{dh}(f(s^n(0), t), \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) \geq 2^{2^{n-1}} \cdot (1 + \text{dh}(t, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}))$  by induction on  $n$ . For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , set  $\underline{m} := s^m(0)$ . Consider the base case  $n = 1$ . Then any maximal derivation

$$f(\underline{1}, t) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} f(0, d(f(0, t))) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} f(0, c(f(0, t), f(0, t))) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^3 c(t, t) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \dots$$

proves this case. For this observe that  $\text{dh}(c(t, t), \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) = 2 \cdot \text{dh}(t, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}})$ , and hence  $\text{dh}(f(\underline{1}, t), t) \geq 5 + 2 \cdot \text{dh}(t, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) > 2^{2^0} \cdot (1 + \text{dh}(t, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}))$ . Notice that we employ lazy reduction of  $d$  in an essential way. For the inductive step, consider a maximal derivation  $f(\underline{n+1}, t) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} f(\underline{n}, d(f(\underline{n}, t))) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} \dots$ . Applying induction hypothesis twice we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dh}(f(\underline{n+1}, t), \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) &> \text{dh}(f(\underline{n}, d(f(\underline{n}, t))), \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) > \text{dh}(f(\underline{n}, f(\underline{n}, t)), \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) \\ &> 2^{2^{n-1}} \cdot (2^{2^{n-1}} \cdot (1 + \text{dh}(t, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}))) \\ &= 2^{2^n} + 2^{2^n} \cdot \text{dh}(t, \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}) . \end{aligned}$$

□

We now present the application of Theorem 4.3 in the context of *implicit computational complexity (ICC)*. Following [10], and extended to nondeterministic computation in [4, 11], we give semantics to TRS  $\mathcal{R}$  as follows:

**Definition 4.6.** Let  $\text{Val} := \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  denote the set of values. Further, let  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \text{Val}$  be a finite set of non-accepting patterns. We call a term  $t$  *accepting* (with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$ ) if there exists no  $p \in \mathcal{P}$  such that  $p\sigma = t$  for some substitution  $\sigma$ . We say that  $\mathcal{R}$  computes the relation  $R \subseteq \text{Val} \times \text{Val}$  with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$  if there exists  $f \in \mathcal{D}$  such that for all  $s, t \in \text{Val}$ ,

$$s R t \quad \text{iff} \quad f(s) \xrightarrow{!}_{\mathcal{R}} t \text{ and } t \text{ is accepting} .$$

On the other hand, we say that a relation  $R$  is computed by  $\mathcal{R}$  if  $R$  is defined by the above equations with respect to some set  $\mathcal{P}$  of non-accepting patterns.

For the case that  $\mathcal{R}$  is *confluent* we also say that  $\mathcal{R}$  computes the (partial) *function* induced by the relation  $R$ . Note that the restriction to binary relations is a non-essential simplification. The assertion that for normal forms  $t$ ,  $t$  is accepting aims to eliminate

by-products of the computation that should not be considered as part of the computed relation  $R$ .

As a consequence of Theorem 4.3 we derive our main result. Following [13, 4] we employ *graph rewriting* [20] to efficiently compute normal forms.

**Theorem 4.7** (Soundness). *Suppose  $\mathcal{R}$  is a constructor TRS compatible with  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$ . The relations computed by  $\mathcal{R}$  are computable in nondeterministic time  $2^{\mathcal{O}(n^k)}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular, if  $\mathcal{R}$  is confluent then  $f \in \text{FEXP}$  for each function  $f$  computed by  $\mathcal{R}$ .*

*Proof.* We sketch the implementation of the relation  $R_f$  (function  $f$ ) on a Turing machine  $M_f$ . Single out the corresponding defined function symbol  $f$ , and consider some arbitrary input  $v \in \text{Val}$ . First writing  $f(v)$  on a dedicated working tape, the machine  $M_f$  iteratively rewrites  $f(v)$  to normal form in an innermost fashion. For non-confluent TRSs  $\mathcal{R}$ , the choice of the redex is performed nondeterministically, otherwise some innermost redex is computed deterministically. By the assumption  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq >_{\text{epo}\star}$ , Theorem 4.3 provides an upper bound  $2^{|f(v)|^{c_1}}$  on the number of iterations for some  $c_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ , i.e., the machine performs at most exponentially many iterations in the size of the input  $v$ . To investigate into the complexity of a single iteration, consider the  $i$ -th iteration with  $t_i$  written on the working tape (where  $f(v) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^i t_i$ ). We want to compute some  $t_{i+1}$  with  $t_i \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} t_{i+1}$ . Observe that in the presence of duplicating rules,  $|t_i|$  might be exponential in  $i$  (and  $|v|$ ). As we can only assume  $i \leq 2^{|f(v)|^{c_1}}$ , we cannot hope to construct  $t_{i+1}$  from  $t_i$  in time exponential in  $|v|$  if we use a representation of terms that is linear in size in the number of symbols. Instead, we employ the machinery of [4]. By taking sharing into account, [4] achieves an encoding of  $t_i$  that is bounded in size polynomially in  $|v|$  and  $i$ . Hence in particular  $t_i$  is encoded in size  $2^{|s|^{c_2}}$  for some  $c_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only on  $\mathcal{R}$ . In the setting of [4] a single step is computable in polynomial time (in the encoding size). And so  $t_{i+1}$  is computable from  $t_i$  in time  $2^{|s|^{c_3}}$  for some  $c_3 \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only on  $\mathcal{R}$ . Overall, we conclude that normal forms are computable in time  $2^{|s|^{c_1}} \cdot 2^{|s|^{c_3}} = 2^{\mathcal{O}(|s|^k)}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  worst case. After the final iteration, the machine  $M_f$  checks whether the computed normal form  $t_l$  is accepting and either accepts or rejects the computation. Using the machinery of [4] pattern matching is polynomial the encoding size of  $t_l$ , by the above bound on encoding sizes the operation is exponential in  $|v|$ . As  $v$  was chosen arbitrary and  $k$  depends only on  $\mathcal{R}$ , we conclude the theorem.  $\square$

In correspondence to Theorem 4.7,  $\text{EPO}\star$  is complete in the following sense. Again this is proved in a separate section below (c.f. Section 4.2).

**Theorem 4.8** (Completeness). *Suppose  $f \in \text{FEXP}$ . Then there exists a confluent, constructor TRS  $\mathcal{R}_f$  computing  $f$  that is compatible with some exponential path order  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$ .*

## 4.1 Soundness

We now prove Theorem 4.3, frequently employing the following:

**Lemma 4.9.** *The inclusions  $\sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} \subseteq \triangleright/\approx \subseteq >_{\text{epo}\star}$  hold and further, if  $s \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $s >_{\text{epo}\star} t$  then  $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ .*

*Proof.* Both properties are straight forward consequences of Definition 4.1 and Definition 4.2. For the second property we require that the precedence  $\succ$  is admissible. One easily verifies that if  $t \notin \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ , then  $\succ$  is *not* admissible.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a TRS compatible with some instance  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$ . The idea behind the proof of Theorem 4.3 is to translate  $\dot{\mapsto}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -derivations into  $>_{\text{epo}}^{\ell}$ -descents for some fixed  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  depending only  $\mathcal{R}$ . Once this translation is established, we can use Theorem 3.5 to bind the runtime-complexity of  $\mathcal{R}$  appropriately. For the moment, suppose  $\mathcal{R}$  is completely defined. We replace this restriction by constructor TRS later on. Since  $\mathcal{R}$  is completely defined, normal forms and constructor terms coincide, and thus  $s \dot{\mapsto}_{\mathcal{R}} t$  if  $s = C[l\sigma], t = C[r\sigma]$  for some rule  $l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}$  where additionally  $l\sigma \in \mathcal{B}$ . Let  $t$  be obtained by rewriting a basic term  $s$ . By the use of  $\sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star}$  in Definition 4.2 every normal argument  $t_i$  of  $t$  is irreducible, i.e.,  $t_i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ . We capture this observation in the definition of  $\mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ :

**Definition 4.10.** *The set  $\mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$  is the least set of terms such that (i)  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ , and (ii) if  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\mathbf{s} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  and  $\mathbf{t} \subseteq \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$  then  $f(\mathbf{s}; \mathbf{t}) \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ .*

Note that  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ .

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a completely defined TRS compatible with  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$ , and let  $s \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ . If  $s \dot{\mapsto}_{\mathcal{R}} t$  then  $t \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $s \dot{\mapsto}_{\mathcal{R}} t$  where  $s \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ , i.e., there exists a rule  $l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $s = C[l\sigma], t = C[r\sigma]$ , and for all direct subterms  $l_i$  of  $l$ ,  $l_i\sigma \in \text{NF}(\mathcal{R})$ . As  $\mathcal{R}$  is completely defined  $\text{NF}(\mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ . We conclude  $l \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\sigma : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ . Since  $s \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ , it follows that  $t \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$  if  $r\sigma \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$  by definition of  $\mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$  and the fact  $l\sigma \notin \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ . Note that  $\mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$  is closed under substitutions with image in  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ , in particular  $r\sigma \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$  follows if  $r \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ . We prove the latter by side induction on  $l >_{\text{epo}\star} r$ .

If  $l_i \geq_{\text{epo}\star} r$  for some direct subterm  $l_i$  of  $l$  then  $r \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  by Lemma 4.9 as  $l \in \mathcal{B}$ . Next, suppose either Definition 4.2.2 or Definition 4.2.3 applies. Then, by definition,  $r = g(r_1, \dots, r_k; r_{k+1}, \dots, r_{k+n})$  for some  $g \in \mathcal{F}$ . For  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $l \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} r_i$  follows from Definition 4.2.2 and Definition 4.2.3. Consequently  $r_i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  employing  $l \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} \subseteq \triangleright/\approx$  (c.f. Lemma 4.9). For  $i \in \{k+1, \dots, k+n\}$  we observe  $l >_{\text{epo}\star} r_i$ . Induction hypothesis yields  $r_i \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ . We conclude  $r \in \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$  by definition of  $\mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ .  $\square$

We embed  $\dot{\mapsto}_{\mathcal{R}}$ -steps in  $>_{\text{epo}}^{\ell}$  using *predicative interpretations*  $\mathcal{I}$ . Lemma 4.11 justifies that we only consider terms from  $\mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow}$ . For each defined symbol  $f$ , let  $f^n$  be a fresh function symbol, and let  $\mathcal{F}_n = \{f^n \mid f \in \mathcal{D}\} \cup \mathcal{C}$ . Here the arity of  $f^n$  is  $k$  where  $\text{nrm}(f) = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ , moreover  $f^n$  is still considered a defined function symbol when applying Definition 3.1. We further extend the (admissible) precedence  $\succ$  to  $\mathcal{F}_n$  in the most obvious way:  $f^n \approx g^n$  if  $f \approx g$  and  $f^n \succ g^n$  if  $f \succ g$ .

**Definition 4.12.** *A predicative interpretation  $\mathcal{I}$  is a mapping  $\mathcal{I} : \mathcal{B}^{\rightarrow} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^{\star}$  defined as follows:*

- 1)  $\mathcal{I}(t) = []$  if  $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ , and otherwise
- 2)  $\mathcal{I}(t) = [f^n(t_1, \dots, t_k)] \frown \mathcal{I}(t_{k+1}) \frown \dots \frown \mathcal{I}(t_{k+n})$  for  $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_{k+n})$ .

The next lemma provides the embedding of root steps for completely defined, compatible, TRSs  $\mathcal{R}$ . Here we could simply define  $\mathcal{I}(t) = f^n(t_1, \dots, t_k)$  in case (ii). The complete definition becomes only essential when we look at closure under context in Lemma 4.14 below.

**Lemma 4.13.** *Let  $s \in \mathcal{B}$  and let  $\sigma : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  be a substitution. If  $s >_{\text{epo}\star} t$  then  $\mathcal{I}(s\sigma) >_{\text{epo}}^{|t|} \mathcal{I}(t\sigma)$ .*

*Proof.* By the assumptions,  $\mathcal{I}(s\sigma) = [f^n(s_1\sigma, \dots, s_l\sigma)] = f^n(s_1\sigma, \dots, s_l\sigma)$  for  $f$  the (defined) root symbol of  $s$  and normal arguments  $s_i$  of  $s$ . If  $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  then the lemma trivially follows as  $\mathcal{I}(t\sigma) = []$ . We prove the remaining cases by induction on the definition of  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$ , thus we have  $s >_{\text{epo}\star} t$  either by Definition 4.2.2 or Definition 4.2.3. Let  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_{k+n})$  and so

$$\mathcal{I}(t\sigma) = [g^n(t_1\sigma, \dots, t_k\sigma)] \frown \mathcal{I}(t_{k+1}\sigma) \frown \dots \frown \mathcal{I}(t_{k+n}\sigma) .$$

Observe that  $\mathcal{I}(x\sigma) = []$  for all variables  $x$  in  $t$ . Using this we see that the length of the list  $\mathcal{I}(t\sigma)$  is bound by  $|t|$ . Hence by Definition 3.1.2, it suffices to verify  $\mathcal{I}(s\sigma) >_{\text{epo}}^{|t|} \mathcal{I}(t_i\sigma)$  for all safe arguments  $t_i$  ( $i \in \{k+1, \dots, m\}$ ), and further

$$f^n(s_1\sigma, \dots, s_l\sigma) >_{\text{epo}}^{|t|} g^n(t_1\sigma, \dots, t_k\sigma) . \quad (2)$$

As we have  $s >_{\text{epo}\star} t_i$  on safe argument  $t_i$ , the former follow by induction hypothesis on the terms  $t_i$ . It remains to verify (2). We continue by case analysis.

- 1) Suppose  $f \succ g$ , i.e., Definition 4.2.2 applies. Then  $f^n \succ g^n$  by definition. By Definition 3.1.3 it suffices to prove  $f^n(s_1\sigma, \dots, s_l\sigma) \triangleright_{\approx} t_i\sigma$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Fix  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . According to Definition 4.2.2  $s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}} t_i$  holds, and thus there exists  $j \in \{1, \dots, l\}$  such that  $s_j \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_i$ . Hence  $s_j \triangleright_{\approx} t_i$  by Lemma 4.9, from which we conclude  $f^n(s_1\sigma, \dots, s_l\sigma) \triangleright_{\approx} t_i\sigma$  since we suppose  $\sigma : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ .
- 2) Suppose  $f^n \approx g^n$ , i.e., Definition 4.2.3 applies. By Definition 3.1.5 it suffices to prove (i)  $s_1\sigma \approx t_1\sigma, \dots, s_{\ell-1}\sigma \approx t_{\ell-1}\sigma$ , (ii)  $s_\ell\sigma \triangleright_{\approx} t_\ell\sigma$ , and further (iii)  $f^n(s_1\sigma, \dots, s_l\sigma) \triangleright_{\approx} t_{\ell+1}\sigma, \dots, f^n(s_1\sigma, \dots, s_l\sigma) \triangleright_{\approx} t_k\sigma$  for some  $\ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . The assumptions in Definition 4.2.3 yield  $s_1 \approx t_1, \dots, s_{\ell-1} \approx t_{\ell-1}$  from which we conclude (i), further  $s_\ell \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_\ell$  from which we conclude (ii) with the help of Lemma 4.9 (using  $s_\ell \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ ), and finally  $s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_{\ell+1}, \dots, s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_k$  from which we obtain (iii) as in the case above.

□

**Lemma 4.14.** *Let  $s, t \in \mathcal{B}^\rightarrow$  and let  $C$  be a context such that  $C[s] \in \mathcal{B}^\rightarrow$ . If  $\mathcal{I}(s) >_{\text{epo}}^\ell \mathcal{I}(t)$  then  $\mathcal{I}(C[s]) >_{\text{epo}}^\ell \mathcal{I}(C[t])$ .*

*Proof.* We show the lemma by induction on  $C$ . It suffices to consider the step case. Observe that by the assumption  $\mathcal{I}(s) >_{\text{epo}}^\ell \mathcal{I}(t)$ ,  $s \notin \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  since otherwise  $\mathcal{I}(s) = []$  is  $>_{\text{epo}}^\ell$ -minimal. We can thus assume  $C = f(s_1, \dots, s_k; s_{k+1}, \dots, C'[\square], \dots, s_{k+l})$  for some context  $C'$  by definition of  $\mathcal{B}^\rightarrow$ . Thus, for each  $u \in \{s, t\}$ ,

$$\mathcal{I}(C[u]) = [f^n(s_1, \dots, s_k)] \frown \mathcal{I}(s_{k+1}) \frown \dots \frown \mathcal{I}(C'[u]) \frown \dots \frown \mathcal{I}(s_{k+l}).$$

By induction hypothesis  $\mathcal{I}(C'[s]) >_{\text{epo}}^\ell \mathcal{I}(C'[t])$ . We conclude using Lemma 3.2.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.15.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a completely defined TRS compatible with  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$ . Let  $s \in \mathcal{B}^\rightarrow$ . If  $s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} t$  then  $\mathcal{I}(s) >_{\text{epo}}^\ell N(t)$  where  $\ell := \max\{|r| \mid l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} t$ . Hence there exists a context  $C$ , substitution  $\sigma$  and rule  $l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $s = C[l\sigma]$  and  $t = C[r\sigma]$ . By the assumption that  $\mathcal{R}$  is completely defined,  $l \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $\sigma : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$ . Since  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq >_{\text{epo}\star}$ , we obtain  $\mathcal{I}(l\sigma) >_{\text{epo}}^\ell \mathcal{I}(r\sigma)$  by Lemma 4.13 (additionally employing  $>_{\text{epo}}^{|r|} \subseteq >_{\text{epo}}^\ell$ ). Lemma 4.14 then establishes  $\mathcal{I}(s) >_{\text{epo}}^\ell \mathcal{I}(t)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.16.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a completely defined, possibly infinite, TRS compatible with  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$ . Suppose  $\ell := \max\{|r| \mid l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}\}$  is well-defined. There exists  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\text{rc}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(n) \leq 2^{\mathcal{O}(n^k)}$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the existence of  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  so that for any  $s \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\text{dh}(s, \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}) \leq 2^{c_1 \cdot |s|^{c_2}}$ . Consider some maximal derivation  $s = t_0 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} t_1 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} \dots \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} t_n$ . Let  $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ . We observed  $t_i \in \mathcal{B}^\rightarrow$  in Lemma 4.11, and thus  $\mathcal{I}(t_i) >_{\text{epo}}^\ell \mathcal{I}(t_{i+1})$  due to Lemma 4.15. So in particular  $\text{dh}(s, \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}) \leq G_\ell(\mathcal{I}(s))$ . We estimate  $G_\ell(\mathcal{I}(s))$  in terms of  $|s|$ : for this, suppose  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_k; s_{k+1}, \dots, s_{k+l})$  for some  $f \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $s_i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  ( $i \in \{1, \dots, k+l\}$ ). By definition  $\mathcal{I}(s) = f^n(s_1, \dots, s_k)$ . Set  $N := \max\{G_\ell(s_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\} + 1$ , and verify

$$N \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k G_\ell(s_i) \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \text{dp}(s_i) \leq |s|. \quad (3)$$

For the second inequality we employ Lemma 3.4, which gives  $G_\ell(s_i) = \text{dp}(s_i)$  as  $s_i \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{V})$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Applying Theorem 3.5 we see

$$\begin{aligned} G_\ell(\mathcal{I}(s)) &= G_\ell(f^n(s_1, \dots, s_k)) \\ &\leq (\ell + 1)^{N^\ell \cdot \text{rk}(f^n) + \sum_{i=1}^k N^{\ell-i} \cdot G_\ell(s_i)} && \text{(by Theorem 3.5)} \\ &\leq (\ell + 1)^{|s|^\ell \cdot \text{rk}(f^n) + |s|^\ell \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k G_\ell(s_i)} && \text{(by Equation 3)} \\ &\leq (\ell + 1)^{|s|^\ell \cdot \text{rk}(f^n) + |s|^\ell \cdot |s|} && \text{(by Equation 3)} \\ &\leq (\ell + 1)^{(\text{rk}(f^n) + 1) \cdot |s|^{\ell+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\ell$  depends only on  $\mathcal{R}$ , and  $\text{rk}(f^n)$  is bounded by some constant depending only on  $\mathcal{F}$ , simple arithmetical reasoning gives the constants  $c_1, c_2$  such that  $\text{dh}(s, \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}) \leq G_\ell(\mathcal{I}(s)) \leq 2^{c_1 \cdot |s|^{c_2}}$ . This concludes the Theorem.  $\square$

We now lift the restriction that  $\mathcal{R}$  is completely defined for constructor TRSs  $\mathcal{R}$ . The idea is to extend  $\mathcal{R}$  with sufficiently many rules so that the resulting system is completely defined and Theorem 4.16 applicable.

**Definition 4.17.** Let  $\perp$  be a fresh constructor symbol and  $\mathcal{R}$  a TRS. We define  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}} := \{t \rightarrow \perp \mid t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{\perp\}, \mathcal{V}) \cap \text{NF}(\mathcal{R}) \text{ and the root symbol of } t \text{ is defined}\}$ .

We extend the precedence  $\succ$  to  $\mathcal{F} \cup \{\perp\}$  so that  $\perp$  is minimal. Thus  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}} \subseteq \succ_{\text{epo}\star}$  follows by one application of Definition 4.2.2. Further, the *completely defined* TRS  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is able to simulate  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}$  derivations for constructor TRS  $\mathcal{R}$ :

**Lemma 4.18.** Suppose  $\mathcal{R}$  is a constructor TRS. Then  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is completely defined. Further, if  $s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}}^{\ell} t$  then  $s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}^{\ell'} t'$  for some  $t'$  and  $\ell' \geq \ell$ .

*Proof.* That  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is completely defined follows by definition. We outline the proof of the second statement. For a complete proof we kindly refer the reader to [3, Section 5.1]. Let  $t\downarrow$  denote the unique normal form of  $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup \{\perp\}, \mathcal{V})$  with respect to  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$  (observe that  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is confluent and terminating by definition). One verifies that for  $l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $\sigma : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \text{NF}(\mathcal{R})$  and  $\sigma_{\downarrow} := \{x \mapsto u\downarrow \mid \sigma(x) = u\}$ ,

$$(l\sigma)\downarrow = l\sigma_{\downarrow} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}} r\sigma_{\downarrow} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}^* (r\sigma)\downarrow. \quad (4)$$

Using equation (4), we obtain  $s\downarrow \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}^+ t\downarrow$  from  $s \xrightarrow{\mathcal{R}} t$  by a straight forward inductive argument. It is not difficult to see that from this we can conclude the lemma.  $\square$

An immediate consequence of Lemma 4.18 is  $\text{rc}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(n) \leq \text{rc}_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}^i(n)$ , i.e., the innermost runtime-complexity of  $\mathcal{R}$  can be analysed through  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$ . We arrive at the proof of our main theorem:

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.* Suppose  $\mathcal{R}$  is a constructor TRS compatible with  $\succ_{\text{epo}\star}$ . We verify that  $\text{rc}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(n)$  is bounded by an exponential  $2^{O(n^k)}$  for some fixed  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ : let  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$  be defined according to Definition 4.17. By Lemma 4.18,  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$  is completely defined, and moreover,  $\text{rc}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(n) \leq \text{rc}_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}^i(n)$ . Clearly  $\max\{|r| \mid l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}\} = 1$ , since  $\mathcal{R}$  is finite we have that  $\max\{|r| \mid l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}\}$  is well-defined. Further  $(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}) \subseteq \succ_{\text{epo}\star}$  follows by the assumption on  $\mathcal{R}$  and definition of  $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Hence all assumptions of Theorem 4.16 are fulfilled, and we conclude  $\text{rc}_{\mathcal{R}}^i(n) \leq \text{rc}_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{R}}}^i(n) \leq 2^{O(n^k)}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

## 4.2 Completeness

To prove Theorem 4.8, we use the characterisation of the exponential time computable functions given in [1] by Arai and the second author, and, the resulting *term rewriting characterisation* given in [14]. We closely follow the presentation of [1, 14], for further motivation of the presented notions we kindly refer the reader to [1, 14].

In the spirit of [7], the class  $\mathcal{N}$  (of functions over binary words) from [1] relies on a syntactic separation of argument positions into *normal* and *safe* ones. To highlight this separation, we write  $f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$  instead of  $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  for normal arguments  $\mathbf{x}$  and safe

arguments  $\mathbf{y}$ . The class  $\mathcal{N}$  is defined as the least class containing certain initial functions and that is closed under the scheme of *(weak) safe composition*

$$f(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) = h(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}; \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})) , \quad (\text{WSC})$$

and *safe nested recursion on notation*

$$\begin{aligned} f(\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &= g(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \\ f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &= h_{\tau(\mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, f(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{t}_{\tau(\mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, f(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})))) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{SNRN})$$

where  $\mathbf{z} \neq \varepsilon$ . The Scheme (WSC) reflects that the exponential time functions are *not* closed under composition. We have presented the Scheme (SNRN) with two nested recursive calls for brevity, however [1] allows an arbitrary (but fixed) number of nestings. Note that here recursion is performed simultaneously on multiple arguments  $\mathbf{z}$ . The functions  $h_{\tau(\mathbf{z})}$  and  $\mathbf{t}_{\tau(\mathbf{z})}$  are previously defined functions, chosen in terms of  $\tau(\mathbf{z}) \in \Sigma_0^k$ . Here  $k$  equals the length of  $\mathbf{z}$ , and  $\Sigma_0^k := \{0, 1, \varepsilon\}^k \setminus \{\varepsilon\}^k$ . Further,  $\mathbf{v}_1$  and  $\mathbf{v}_2$  are unique predecessors of  $\mathbf{z}$  defined in terms of  $\tau(\mathbf{z})$ . In [1] it is proved that  $\mathcal{N}$  coincides with FEXP.

The term rewriting characterisation from [14] expresses the definition of  $\mathcal{N}$  as an *infinite* rewrite system  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}$ , depicted below. Here binary words are formed from the constructor symbols  $\varepsilon$ ,  $S_0$  and  $S_1$ . For notational reasons we use  $S_\varepsilon(; z)$  to denote  $\varepsilon$ . The function symbols  $O^{k,l}$ ,  $I_r^{k,l}$ ,  $P$ ,  $C$  correspond to the initial functions of  $\mathcal{N}$ . The symbol  $\text{SUB}[g, i_1, \dots, i_k, \mathbf{h}]$  is used to denote the function obtained by composing functions  $g$  and  $\mathbf{h}$  according to the Scheme (WSC). Finally, the function symbol  $\text{SNRN}[g, h_w, \mathbf{s}_w, \mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)]$  corresponds to the function defined by safe nested recursion on notation from  $g$ ,  $h_w$ ,  $\mathbf{s}_w$ ,  $\mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)$  in accordance to Scheme (SNRN). We highlight the separation of safe and normal argument positions directly in the rules. The TRS  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}$  consists of the rules

$$\begin{aligned} O^{k,l}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &\rightarrow \varepsilon & P(; \varepsilon) &\rightarrow \varepsilon \\ I_r^{k,l}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &\rightarrow x_r \text{ for } r \in \{1, \dots, k\} & P(; S_i(; x)) &\rightarrow x \\ I_r^{k,l}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &\rightarrow y_{r-k} \text{ for } r \in \{k+1, \dots, l+k\} & C(; \varepsilon, y_0, y_1) &\rightarrow y_0 \\ \text{SUB}[g, i_1, \dots, i_k, \mathbf{h}](\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &\rightarrow g(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}; \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})) & C(; S_i(; x), y_0, y_1) &\rightarrow y_i \\ \text{SNRN}[g, h_w, \mathbf{s}_w, \mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)](\varepsilon, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &\rightarrow g(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \\ \text{SNRN}[g, h_w, \mathbf{s}_w, \mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)](S_{i_1} (; z_1), \dots, S_{i_k} (; z_k), \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) &\rightarrow \\ h_{i_1 \dots i_k}(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, \text{SNRN}[g, h_w, \mathbf{s}_w, \mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)](\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{a})) & \\ [s_{i_1 \dots i_k}(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, \text{SNRN}[g, h_w, \mathbf{s}_w, \mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)](\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{b}))/\mathbf{a}] & \\ [t_{i_1 \dots i_k}(\mathbf{v}_3, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, \text{SNRN}[g, h_w, \mathbf{s}_w, \mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)](\mathbf{v}_3, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}))/\mathbf{b}] & \\ \text{where } \{\varepsilon\}^k &\neq \{i_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\} \subseteq \{\varepsilon, 0, 1\}^k. \end{aligned}$$

Abbreviate  $\mathbf{u} = u_1, \dots, u_k = S_{i_1} (; z_1), \dots, S_{i_k} (; z_k)$ , and consider for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  arguments  $\mathbf{v}_j = v_1, \dots, v_k$ . The arguments  $\mathbf{v}_j$  are  $\succ$ -predecessors [1] of  $\mathbf{u}$ . This gives

some  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that (i)  $u_1 = v_1, \dots, u_{i-1} = v_{i-1}$ , (ii)  $u_i \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} v_i$  and (iii)  $u_{i+1} \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} v_{i+1}, \dots, u_k \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} v_k$  for some  $l_{i+1}, \dots, l_k \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

By the results from [14], it follows that for each function  $f$  from FEXP there exists a *finite restriction*  $\mathcal{R}_f$  of  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}$  which computes the function  $f$ . Hence to prove Theorem 4.8, it suffices to orient each finite restriction of  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}$  by an instance of EPO $\star$ .

*Proof of Theorem 4.8.* Consider some arbitrary function  $f \in \text{FEXP}$  and the corresponding TRS  $\mathcal{R}_f \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}$  computing  $f$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the signature consisting of function symbols appearing in  $\mathcal{R}_f$ . For function symbols  $g, h \in \mathcal{F}$ , we define  $g \succ h$  in the precedence iff  $r(g) > r(h)$ , where

- 1)  $r(g) := 1$  for  $g \in \{O^{k,l}, I_r^{k,l}, P, C\}$ ,
- 2)  $r(\text{SUB}[g, i_1, \dots, i_k, \mathbf{h}]) := \max\{r(g), r(\mathbf{h})\} + 1$ , and
- 3)  $r(\text{SNRN}[g, h_w, \mathbf{s}_w, \mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)]) := \max\{r(g), r(h_w), r(\mathbf{s}_w), r(\mathbf{t}_w) \mid w \in \Sigma_0^k\} + 1$ .

Further, define the safe mapping **safe** as indicated by the system  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}$ . Then it can be shown that  $R_f \subseteq >_{\text{epo}\star}$  for  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$  induced by  $\succ$ . We only consider the most interesting case, the orientation of the final rule. For brevity, we only consider two level of nestings. The argument can be easily extended to the general case. Abbreviate  $\text{SNRN}[g, h_w, \mathbf{s}_w, \mathbf{t}_w (w \in \Sigma_0^k)]$  as  $f$ . We show

$$u := f(S_{i_1}(\cdot; z_1), \dots, S_{i_k}(\cdot; z_k), \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) >_{\text{epo}\star} h_{i_1 \dots i_k}(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, f(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{t}_w(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, f(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}))))).$$

By Definition 4.2.1, we obtain  $u >_{\text{epo}\star} y_i$  for  $y_i \in \mathbf{y}$ . Further Definition 4.1 gives  $u \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} x_i$  for  $x_i \in \mathbf{x}$ . Thus by Definition 4.2.3 and the observation below the system  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{N}}$  we conclude  $u >_{\text{epo}\star} f(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})$ . In particular, the observations on  $\mathbf{v}_2$  also give  $u \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} v_j$  for  $v_1, \dots, v_k = \mathbf{v}_2$ . By Definition 4.2.2 we see  $u >_{\text{epo}\star} t_w(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, f(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}))$ , by Definition 4.2.3 we obtain

$$u >_{\text{epo}\star} f(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{t}_w(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}, f(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}))) .$$

We conclude with a final application of Definition 4.2.2. □

## 5 Implementation

We reduce the problem of finding an instance  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$  such that  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq >_{\text{epo}\star}$  holds to the *Boolean satisfiability problem SAT*. To simplify the presentation, we extend language of propositional logic with truth-constants  $\top$  and  $\perp$  in the obvious way. To encode the (admissible) precedence  $\succ$ , we introduce for  $f, g \in \mathcal{D}$  propositional variables  $\succ_{f,g}$  and  $\approx_{f,g}$  to encode the strict and equivalence part of  $\succ$ . We use the standard approach [21] to assert that those variables encode a quasi-precedence on  $\mathcal{D}$ . Recall that constructors are minimal in the precedence. To simplify notation we set for  $f \notin \mathcal{D}$  or  $g \notin \mathcal{D}$

$$\succ_{f,g} := \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } g \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \perp & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad \approx_{f,g} := \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } f \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } g \in \mathcal{C}, \\ \perp & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Further, to encode whether  $i \in \text{safe}(f)$  we use the variables  $\text{safe}_{f,i}$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $n$ -ary  $f \in \mathcal{D}$ . Recall that arguments positions of constructors are always safe. We set  $\text{safe}_{f,i} := \top$  for  $n$ -ary  $f \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . To increase the strength of our implementation, we orient the system  $\mu(\mathcal{R})$  obtained from  $\mathcal{R}$  by permuting arguments according to a fixed permutation per function symbol, expressed by mappings  $\mu_f : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$  for  $n$ -ary  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ . The mapping is lifted to terms in the obvious way:

$$\mu(t) := \begin{cases} t & \text{if } t \in \mathcal{V} \\ f(t_{\mu_f(1)}, \dots, t_{\mu_f(n)}) & \text{if } t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n). \end{cases}$$

We set  $\mu(\mathcal{R}) := \{\mu(l) \rightarrow \mu(r) \mid l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ . It is easy to see that  $\mu$  does not change derivation heights, in particular,  $\text{rc}_{\mathcal{R}}^i = \text{rc}_{\mu(\mathcal{R})}^i$ . To encode the mapping  $\mu_f$  for  $n$ -ary  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  we use propositional variables  $\mu_{f,i,k}$  for  $i, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . The meaning of  $\mu_{f,i,k}$  is that argument position  $i$  of  $f$  should be considered as argument position  $k$ , i.e.,  $\mu(i) = k$ , compare also [21]. We require that those variables encode a permutation on argument positions, which is straight forward to formulate in propositional logic.

To ensure a consistent use of safe argument positions in the constraints below, we require that if  $f \approx g$ , then their arities match and further, safe argument positions coincide as expressed by the constraint

$$\text{comp}_{\mathcal{F}}(\text{safe}, \approx) := \bigwedge_{f,g \in \mathcal{F}} \approx_{f,g} \rightarrow \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \bigwedge_{j=1}^n \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \mu_{f,i,k} \wedge \mu_{g,j,k} \rightarrow (\text{safe}_{f,i} \leftrightarrow \text{safe}_{g,j}). \quad (5)$$

Here  $n$  denotes the arity of  $f$  and  $g$ .

Let  $s, t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{V})$  be two concrete terms. We encode  $s \approx t$  (respecting the argument permutation  $\mu$ ) as the constraint  $\lceil s \approx t \rceil$  defined as follows:

$$\lceil s \approx t \rceil := \begin{cases} \top & \text{if } s = t, \\ \approx_{f,g} \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \bigwedge_{j=1}^n \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \mu_{f,i,k} \wedge \mu_{g,j,k} \rightarrow \lceil s_i \approx t_j \rceil & \text{if } (\star), \\ \perp & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here  $(\star)$  denotes  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$  and  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ . The comparison  $s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t$  is expressed by

$$\lceil f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t \rceil := \bigvee_{i=1}^n c_i \wedge (\lceil s_i \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t \rceil \vee \lceil s_i \approx t \rceil)$$

where  $c_i = \top$  if  $f \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $c_i = \neg \text{safe}_{f,i}$  if  $f \in \mathcal{D}$ . For  $s \in \mathcal{V}$  we set  $\lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t \rceil := \perp$ . Next we consider the comparison  $s >_{\text{epo}\star} t$ , and set

$$\lceil s >_{\text{epo}\star} t \rceil := \lceil s >_{\text{epo}\star}^{(1)} t \rceil \vee \lceil s >_{\text{epo}\star}^{(2,3)} t \rceil.$$

Here  $\lceil s >_{\text{epo}\star}^{(1)} t \rceil$  is the encoding of Case 1,  $\lceil s >_{\text{epo}\star}^{(2,3)} t \rceil$  expresses Case 2 and Case 3 from Definition 4.2. The constraint  $\lceil s >_{\text{epo}\star}^{(1)} t \rceil$  is expressed similar to above:

$$\lceil f(s_1, \dots, s_n) >_{\text{epo}\star}^{(1)} t \rceil := \bigvee_{i=1}^n \lceil s_i >_{\text{epo}\star} t \rceil \vee \lceil s_i \approx t \rceil,$$

and  $\lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t \rceil := \perp$  for  $s \in \mathcal{V}$ .

Let  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_l; s_{l+1}, \dots, s_{l+m})$ ,  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_k; t_{k+1}, \dots, t_{k+n})$ , and reconsider Definition 4.2.2 and Definition 4.2.3. In both cases we require  $s >_{\text{epo}\star} t_j$  for safe argument positions  $j \in \{k+1, \dots, k+n\}$ . If  $f \succ g$ , additionally  $s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_j$  has to hold for all normal argument positions  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . On the other hand, if  $f \approx g$ , then we need to check the *stronger* statement (i)  $s_1 \overset{s}{\approx} t_1, \dots, s_{i-1} \overset{s}{\approx} t_{i-1}$ , (ii)  $s_i \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_i$  and (iii)  $s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_{i+1}, \dots, s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_k$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, \min(l, k)\}$ . Note here that (i) and (ii) (and trivially (iii)) imply  $s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_i$ . We encode conditions (i) and (ii) in the constraint  $\lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star, 1}^{\text{lex}} t \rceil$  defined below. Then Definition 4.2.2 and Definition 4.2.3 is expressible by the constraint

$$\begin{aligned} \lceil f(s_1, \dots, s_n) >_{\text{epo}\star}^{(2,3)} g(t_1, \dots, t_m) \rceil &:= (\succ_{f,g} \vee \approx_{f,g} \wedge \lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star, 1}^{\text{lex}} t \rceil) \\ &\quad \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^m (\text{safe}_{g,j} \rightarrow \lceil s >_{\text{epo}\star} t_j \rceil) \wedge (\neg \text{safe}_{g,j} \rightarrow \lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star} t_j \rceil) . \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining cases, we set  $\lceil s >_{\text{epo}\star}^{(2,3)} t \rceil := \perp$ . Further, we set for  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star, k}^{\text{lex}} t \rceil &:= \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \bigwedge_{j=1}^n \bigwedge_{k=1}^n (\mu_{f,i,k} \wedge \mu_{g,j,k} \rightarrow (\text{safe}_{f,i} \rightarrow \lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star, k+1}^{\text{lex}} t \rceil) \\ &\quad \wedge (\neg \text{safe}_{f,i} \rightarrow (\lceil s_i \sqsupset_{\text{epo}} t_j \rceil \vee (\lceil s_i \overset{s}{\approx} t_j \rceil \wedge \lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star, k+1}^{\text{lex}} t \rceil))) \end{aligned}$$

and  $\lceil s \sqsupset_{\text{epo}\star, k}^{\text{lex}} t \rceil := \perp$  for  $k > n$ .

Finally, compatibility of the TRS  $\mu(\mathcal{R})$  is expressible as the constraint

$$\text{epo}(\mathcal{R}) := \text{comp}_{\mathcal{F}}(\text{safe}, \succ) \wedge \text{prec}_{\mathcal{F}}(\succ) \wedge \text{bijection}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu) \wedge \bigwedge_{l \rightarrow r \in \mathcal{R}} \lceil l >_{\text{epo}\star} r \rceil ,$$

where  $\text{comp}_{\mathcal{F}}(\text{safe}, \succ)$  is as defined in Equation 5,  $\text{prec}_{\mathcal{F}}(\succ)$  asserts a correct encoding of the admissible quasi-precedence  $\succ$  and  $\text{bijection}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mu)$  asserts that  $\mu_f$  for  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  indeed correspond to bijections on argument positions.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be a TRS such that the constraint  $\text{epo}(\mathcal{R})$  is satisfiable. Then  $\mu(\mathcal{R}) \subseteq >_{\text{epo}\star}$  for some argument permutation  $\mu$  and exponential path order  $>_{\text{epo}\star}$ .*

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper we present the *exponential path order*  $\text{EPO}^\star$ . Suppose a term rewrite system  $\mathcal{R}$  is compatible with  $\text{EPO}^\star$ , then the runtime complexity of  $\mathcal{R}$  is bounded from above by an exponential function. Further,  $\text{EPO}^\star$  is sound and complete for the class of functions computable in exponential time on a Turing machine. We have implemented  $\text{EPO}^\star$  in the complexity tool  $\text{TCT}$ .<sup>1</sup>  $\text{TCT}$  can automatically prove exponential runtime complexity of our motivating example  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{fib}}$ . Due to Theorem 4.7 we thus obtain through an automatic analysis that the computation of the Fibonacci number is exponential.

<sup>1</sup>See <http://cl-informatik.uibk.ac.at/software/tct/>, the experimental data for our implementation is available here: <http://cl-informatik.uibk.ac.at/software/tct/experiments/epostar>.

## References

- [1] T. Arai and N. Eguchi. A New Function Algebra of EXPTIME Functions by Safe Nested Recursion. *TCL*, 10(4), 2009.
- [2] T. Arai and G. Moser. Proofs of Termination of Rewrite Systems for Polytime Functions. In *Proc. of 15th FSTTCS*, volume 3821 of *LNCS*, pages 529–540, 2005.
- [3] M. Avanzini. Automation of Polynomial Path Orders. Master’s thesis, University of Innsbruck, Institute of Computer Science., 2009. Available at <http://cl-informatik.uibk.ac.at/~zini/publications/masterthesis.pdf>.
- [4] M. Avanzini and G. Moser. Closing the Gap Between Runtime Complexity and Polytime Computability. In *Proc. of 21st RTA*, volume 6 of *LIPIcs*, pages 33–48, 2010.
- [5] F. Baader and T. Nipkow. *Term Rewriting and All That*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [6] P. Baillot, J.-Y. Marion, and S. Ronchi Della Rocca. Guest editorial: Special Issue on Implicit Computational Complexity. *TOCL*, 10(4), 2009.
- [7] S. Bellantoni and S. Cook. A new Recursion-Theoretic Characterization of the Polytime Functions. *CC*, 2(2):97–110, 1992.
- [8] A. Ben-Amram, N. D. Jones, and L. Kristiansen. Linear, Polynomial or Exponential? Complexity Inference in Polynomial Time. In *Proc. of 4th CiE*, volume 5028 of *LNCS*, pages 67–76, 2008.
- [9] G. Bonfante, A. Cichon, J.-Y. Marion, and H. Touzet. Algorithms with Polynomial Interpretation Termination Proof. *JFP*, 11(1):33–53, 2001.
- [10] G. Bonfante, J.-Y. Marion, and J.-Y. Moyen. Quasi-interpretations: A Way to Control Resources. *TCS*, 2009. To appear.
- [11] G. Bonfante and G. Moser. Characterising Space Complexity Classes via Knuth-Bendix Orders. In *Proc. of 17th LPAR*, volume 6397 of *LNCS*, pages 142–156, 2010.
- [12] C. Choppy, S. Kaplan, and M. Soria. Complexity Analysis of Term-Rewriting Systems. *TCS*, 67(2–3):261–282, 1989.
- [13] U. Dal Lago and S. Martini. On Constructor Rewrite Systems and the Lambda-Calculus. In *Proc. of 36th ICALP*, volume 5556 of *LNCS*, pages 163–174, 2009.
- [14] N. Eguchi. A Lexicographic Path Order with Slow Growing Derivation Bounds. *MLQ*, 55(2):212–224, 2009.

- [15] J. Endrullis, J. Waldmann, and H. Zantema. Matrix Interpretations for Proving Termination of Term Rewriting. *JAR*, 40(3):195–220, 2008.
- [16] N. Hirokawa and G. Moser. Automated Complexity Analysis Based on the Dependency Pair Method. In *Proc. of 4th IJCAR*, volume 5195 of *LNAI*, pages 364–380, 2008.
- [17] D. Hofbauer and C. Lautemann. Termination Proofs and the Length of Derivations. In *Proc. of 3rd RTA*, volume 355 of *LNCS*, pages 167–177, 1989.
- [18] Dexter C. Kozen. *Theory of Computation*. Springer Verlag, first edition, 2006.
- [19] G. Moser. Proof Theory at Work: Complexity Analysis of Term Rewrite Systems. *CoRR*, abs/0907.5527, 2009. Habilitation Thesis.
- [20] D. Plump. Essentials of Term Graph Rewriting. *ENTCS*, 51:277–289, 2001.
- [21] P. Schneider-Kamp, C. Fuhs, R. Thiemann, J. Giesl, E. Annov, M. Codish, A. Middeldorp, and H. Zankl. Implementing RPO and POLO Using SAT. In *DDP*, number 07401 in *LIPIcs*. Dagstuhl, 2007.